

Johannes Maccovius

DISPUTATION XXV

Are we bound to invoke Christ?

Respondent: Peter Czimmmerman, Prussian.

Thesis I.

Are we bound to invoke Christ? The adversaries deny it, who teach that we are able to invoke him, but not that we are bound to do so. We affirm it. The argument is this: because the examples in Sacred Scripture show it—Acts 7:59; Acts 9:14; 1 Thessalonians 3:11; and to omit others, 2 Corinthians 12:8–9.

2. You will say: but it is not permitted, either in divine or in human matters, to argue from a fact to a law, and it is unjust to make a law from a deed.

Response: examples have the force of law, but not all, rather only certain ones. That this may be rightly understood, we will subjoin the kinds of examples, from which it is plain which are to be held for law and which not.

3. Therefore, first of all, particular examples are set before us in Scripture, as types or patterns (παράδειγματα), so that we may either imitate or avoid them. And then the same are to be held as under a common law, as is evident from 1 Corinthians 10:11; Philippians 4:8–10; Hebrews 11 throughout the whole chapter; Hebrews 12:3, etc.

Secondly, those deeds which were done by men as saints and Christians, must also be done by all who wish to be held as saints and Christians. But those deeds which were done by some as ministers, prophets, or magistrates, are to be imitated not indeed by all, but by those who are called to the same offices.

4. The latter part is most clear; the former is proved by these passages: 2 Timothy 3:20; Philippians 4:9; 1 Corinthians 4:17. And hence it is that James argues from us the particular example of Elijah (James 5:17), and Paul from the example of Abraham (Romans 4:24). And indeed these are to be held for law to us, as is evident from the proof. But those deeds which were done for a special cause, must be performed only in the same cause—as is plain from Luke 4:25–27; Matthew 12:4–5. Likewise, those deeds which were done by extraordinary calling and gifts, are to be imitated only (as far as the special manner of acting is concerned) by those who are adorned with the same calling and the same gifts. This is plain from Luke 9:54–55. And therefore these two kinds of examples ought not to be held as common law.

5. Now let us inquire to what kind of examples those belong which we adduced for the invocation of Christ. And no one will be able to deny that they belong to those

deeds which were done by men as saints and Christians. Nay, Socinus himself expressly confesses this, in his Epistle, p. 213, saying: "Therefore you judged rightly that it also seemed to me very probable that he who does not wish, or does not dare, to invoke the Lord Jesus Christ, is scarcely worthy of the name of Christian; unless rather, not scarcely, but not at all. And not only does this seem probable to me, but it is most persuasively certain to me." Let the adversaries weigh this very point, and they will acknowledge that the matter cannot be otherwise. Therefore, those examples are to be laws, and held in place of precepts.

6. Our second argument we draw from this, that Christ expressly commands and orders his disciples to invoke him, John 16:24. Socinus responds to this argument in *Instit. Christ. Relig.*, p. 108, where he raises this question:

"These your words remind me to ask you something, which I ought to have asked before, and to object to your interpretation of the expression we are now treating, so that now at once I may object both to you and to these your very words. For tell me, I pray you: are not the disciples commanded by Christ in those places to ask in his name? Can it not, consequently, be otherwise? How then do you speak as though it could be asked, although not in Christ's name? Or how can your interpretation be sustained, which wishes 'to ask in Christ's name' to signify asking expressly and simply from Christ himself, which nevertheless we can often not do? For indeed it has been continually confirmed by the universal usage of the Church of Christ and by the Apostles themselves, that above all the words of prayer were directed expressly and simply to Christ himself."

And to this question he responds: "I deny that Christ in those places precisely commanded anything; but I contend that he only diligently admonished and exhorted."

7. But what greater proof of a ruined cause can there be? For are not those things to which Christ exhorts and admonishes, precepts? Away with such follies! But lest the adversary think the matter is carried on with words alone, behold the arguments by which we prove that Christ's admonitions and exhortations are precepts. The first we draw from Matthew 3:17: "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased; hear him." Therefore it is a precept that we hear him; therefore we ought to hear him when he admonishes and exhorts.

The second argument: either no exhortation of Christ is a precept, or at least some is. If none, then neither are those in Matthew 5:16; Matthew 6:1–3, etc. But who, I ask, does not see that those admonitions are precepts? If some, let the adversary show the reason why some should be such and not all. Certainly the adversary will be able to bring forward no just reason here by which to defend himself.

8. But let us see what Socinus himself thinks on this matter. We will produce two passages which he himself brings forward in different places, and from these let us

make a judgment on this matter. Thus therefore he, in the exposition of Matthew chapter 6, page 293:

“Now indeed, although up to this point we have not been able to find a place in the Law where it has been simply and absolutely commanded to the people that they should pray to God, nor perhaps could such a place be found; nevertheless we do not doubt that every pious person, even under the Old Testament, frequently prayed to God; and that the command, although not expressly, yet tacitly was drawn from the whole nature of religion itself, and could deservedly be said to have been given.”

And these are Socinus’ words concerning prayer and the invocation of God. Now let us see what he writes about the invocation of Christ. Thus he, in the refutation of the Theses of Francis David, page 5:

“But how should we dare to deny that some good things may be asked from Christ, now translated into heaven? since from almost countless places it is known that he, being endowed with supreme power, dwelling in heaven, takes care of the Church and of his own, and is present with them and helps them in due time. Does he not here plainly wish a similar reasoning (although he everywhere thinks that there is no command, either in the Old Testament about invoking and praying to God, or in the New about Christ), to that which he formerly taught concerning God in the Old Testament? For if there it was not expressly by command, nevertheless tacitly from the force of the whole religion it was given; why then may not the same thing, or a command of this kind, be from the force of this religion? For this also is religion, according to the opinion of the Socinians—that Christ, a mere man, has attained the highest power, which, they say, implies his invocation.”

9. But let us explain the matter more clearly according to the opinion of our adversaries themselves. Thus they judge: that God the Father now governs and rules no one until the day of judgment, but has handed over all government to Christ. Thus Smalcus in *Examination of Errors Recently Invented*, p. 55. Socinus, however, in the *Ecclesiastical Antitheses*, p. 189, speaks thus:

“To invoke him, that is, to implore his help and assistance in our necessities, is the same as if one were to implore God himself, since it is certain that he hears our prayers in the name of God and is able to grant all things that we need.”

These things which we have brought forward from the adversaries are impious; yet if they are compared among themselves, everyone sees their inconsistency. For whether they wish it or not, they are compelled to say what their own master earlier said concerning the worship of God: that religion itself shows that this command has been given—if not explicitly, at least implicitly. For if God now governs and rules no

one in his own person, but Christ does, how will it not be necessary to invoke Christ? Or if he hears our prayers in the name of God, how again will it not necessarily follow that prayers must be directed to him? For if one must go to God through Christ, how then will one not first have to go to him through whom one goes to God?

10. We propose a third argument as follows. Worship is owed to Christ, and therefore we must worship him; therefore also we must invoke him. The antecedent is clear, not only from other passages but also from Hebrews 1. The consequence is certain, because invocation is a part of worship and religious service, as is evident from this: when the Holy Spirit speaks of all worship that was rendered to foreign gods, he is accustomed to express it under the name of adoration (Joshua 24; Judges 2:12–14; Judges 3:7), likewise under the name of reverence and fear (Judges 6:10; 2 Kings 17:28, 32, 33), and it also includes under the name of reverence the bending of the body and the offering of sacrifices, as is clear in the same place, verse 35. Yet Scripture often comprehends all these either under the name of invocation and worship (Exodus 20), or also under the name of adoration and service (Matthew 4:10), or simply under the name of service (Acts 7:42; Galatians 4:8). From these things it is now clear that adoration, worship, service, fear, and reverence comprehend all worship; and therefore, when God was angry with the nations because they invoked their gods, invocation was certainly included in these things. Therefore invocation is included in worship and adoration; and consequently, since there is a command to worship Christ, invocation is also included in this command.

11. Socinus replies that to worship is one thing and to invoke is another, in Book of Epistles, p. 327. He says that by examples of hymns, praises, and thanksgivings being offered, he intended to show nothing else than that Christ's worship can exist without invocation. But all the things we have brought forward overturn this. For we have shown that under the name of adoration all worship of God is contained, and thus prayers or invocation as well. Moreover, we have further shown this from Luke 2:37: She served God with prayers and fastings, where prayers are set forth as part of that service. Now that service and adoration are equivalent is clear from what has been said above. Therefore, if we must serve Christ, we are certainly bound also to invoke him.

12. We put forward a fourth argument as follows. If we are able to invoke Christ, then we are also obligated to do so. The antecedent is true according to the opinion of the adversaries; therefore the consequent also follows. The consequence is clear, because we can never invoke anyone unless he is omniscient and sees not only external things but also internal ones—namely the heart itself—and this of all men simultaneously and at once. But these things belong to God alone. Therefore, if Christ is such, he will be God, and thus we must invoke him. Now Socinus himself

admits that Christ knows not only external things but also the internal things of the heart, in his disputation *Against Franciscus Davidis*, p. 11:

“That Christ,” he says, “not only understands our prayers, but knows all our works, indeed searches hearts and reins, is manifest from those two chapters of the Apocalypse which have been cited. For not only does he say to each of the seven churches, ‘I know your works,’ but to the church of Thyatira he expressly adds, ‘I am he who searches the reins and hearts,’ etc.”

13. That God alone knows the heart of man is clear from Jeremiah 17, where God attributes this to himself alone. Therefore, if this applies to Christ, he will be God and thus necessarily to be invoked. Secondly, that God alone knows all things simultaneously and at once is clear from Hebrews 4:13. Now it is certain that if we are able to invoke Christ, it is necessary that he know simultaneously and at once all who invoke him and their hearts. For if in different regions of the world he is invoked by different people concerning different matters, how will he be able to hear them unless he knows all things simultaneously and at once?

14. Socinus replies to this argument in his disputation *On the Adoration of Christ*, which he conducted with Francken, asserting that even in a creature such knowledge can occur. His words are these, on page 23:

“As if even the vilest creatures (observe, I beg you, the profaneness of this man), especially in comparison with Christ himself, were not to be found which perceive things very far removed from themselves, as is known in the case of the lynx— not to mention other senses such as hearing and smell. For the wild boar hears sounds from very great distances; the kite, moreover, detects the odors of carcasses from extremely far away. From this one may understand that the glorified Christ, a creature in every respect the most excellent of all creatures, can see, hear, and know things very far removed from his substance and most abstracted from it, and that this contains nothing absurd.”

But we have already shown earlier that the knowledge of hearts belongs to God alone; and therefore this profane discourse of Socinus is utterly overturned.

15. We will for the present pass over many arguments, intending to treat them elsewhere, and we will respond to the adversary’s arguments when first we have set forth the reason why Socinus fell into this position. He himself explains it in the Epistle prefixed to the Disputation with Francis David, in these words:
“*And although I have often shown them both by word and by writing that there is no reason why anyone should here be offended, indeed that this is the sole reason, and*

that the mouths of those who from the invocation of Christ gather that there is another God of Israel are plainly to be stopped ..."

Here it may be seen that he fears lest, if he should concede that there is a command concerning the invocation of Christ, he be forced to concede that He is eternal God. But plainly, whatever he says, he is entangled here. For, first, he doubts whether there exists anywhere a command about invoking God alone, p. 266 in the disputation with Francis David: *"Concerning that command, namely of invoking God alone, enough has already been said, and it has been shown either that it does not exist, or if we wish to grant that it exists, what sort of force it may have; nor, even if it did exist, would it be necessary that we should also have a command about invoking Christ, since it would be sufficient if it had not been expressly forbidden that Christ be invoked."*

If therefore it does not exist, as falsely he says, on what ground will he now fear, lest if Christ be invoked it must be conceded that He is eternal God? Already about the invocation of Christ he denies that any command exists, and yet he seems to affirm that it does. For thus he says in the disputation with Francis David, p. 176: *"Although by the things we have just said, a sufficient response has been given to all that you here say, yet we will add this, that you have not observed that the same Christ who had said to the disciples that He had made known to them all things which He had heard, the same afterwards said that He had many things yet to say to them which they could not yet bear. Among which, if the worship and invocation of God through Him and in Him be reckoned, what absurdity would there be contained in this matter?"*

16. First, it must be noted that to prove this, Socinus uses the very argument by which the Papists are accustomed to prove anything whatsoever. Second, if among those things which are there to be understood, invocation ought to be reckoned, how should there not be a command concerning it? Since Christ says of all things which He taught, whether before or after the resurrection: *"Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you,"* Matt. 28:20. Therefore either He willed all the things He taught to be observed by all who were to be taught, or at least some things: if the latter, then the Adversaries must give a reason why He willed some of the things which He taught to be observed and others not; but no reason will they be able to give, since everywhere Christ is to be heard, Matt. 3:17. But if of all, then also this He commanded to be observed.

17. But now let us see the objection. Socinus denies therefore that there exists any command about invoking Christ, and he uses this argument which exists in the response to Francis David, p. 18, in these words: *"Those therefore who affirm that we ought to invoke Christ, seem indeed to affirm that when we wish to pray, we ought to direct our prayers to Christ Himself. But that this is far from the truth is shown by the*

very testimonies of Holy Scripture, whereby it is plain that the Apostles sometimes prayed to God, not directing the words of prayer to Christ."

18. This is objected to him by Niemojevius, who otherwise was a follower of Socinus, in the book of Epistles, p. 282: *"This inference is vain; for, he says, equally from the same middle term it would follow that God Himself can be invoked, but ought not: because God the Father is not always invoked. For Stephen invoked Christ alone; Paul also is read to have done so not once."*

19. Socinus replies that Christ is subordinated to God, and that this is the nature of subordinates, that if He be invoked, even though God be not expressly invoked, He must nevertheless be deemed to be invoked. See p. 283. But who does not see that Socinus here begs the question, and presupposes as true those very things which are controverted between us and him: (1) That Christ is not equal with God, which has already been proved by us; (2) That someone who is not God can be invoked, which likewise has been proved false above.

20. Although the Adversary is pressed by this reply of Niemojevius, nevertheless we by other objections refute him the more abundantly; having first set forth the hypothesis which the adversary's reasoning presupposes, which is this: If in Scripture in the narration of some fact of the saints something is not reported, then this fact did not occur. For behold, concerning baptism it is read that the Apostles were commanded to baptize in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit; yet it is not read that they did this, but only that they baptized in the name of Christ, Acts 2:38; Acts 10:48. Did therefore the Apostles act otherwise than as they were commanded? Who pious would believe this?

But because the Adversaries deny that Matt. 28 speaks of Baptism, we will destroy the hypothesis by another objection, which we take from the Lord's Supper: in the celebration of which, as we read in Scripture, Acts 2:42, Acts 20:7, only the breaking of bread is mentioned. Can we therefore in the Lord's Supper use wine, but so as not to be bound to do it? The Adversaries will not say this. But even Socinus himself, although adducing a false example to this, yet removes his own hypothesis. Thus he says concerning the use of the Lord's Supper, p. 39: *"Although moreover it can be understood from the words of Paul, that not even this is necessary, that in celebrating the Lord's Supper this mention be made openly and expressly; for among the Corinthians it was not solely made, this is shown by the fact that Paul recalls to their memory Christ's institution, and yet in the meantime does not reprove them for omitting to make this mention expressly, although he would without doubt have reproved them if he had judged it necessary."*

Thus far Socinus, where he affirms that the proclamation of the Lord's death was omitted in the celebration of the Supper, and yet that they were not reproved by Paul. But how does he show that it was omitted? Because, namely, no mention of it is made. But this is foolish. For how could it have been omitted and they not reproved, since Christ commanded it to be done in remembrance of Him, Luke 22? Therefore because there is no mention of this, it cannot therefore be said that it was not done.

THE END

DISPUTATION FIVE

Whether the Spirit is a Person and true God?

Respondent: FRIDERICK MYLANDER, Palatinate

THESIS I

Concerning this question—whether the Holy Spirit is a Person and true God—we shall defend both parts affirmatively, and the first indeed with these arguments.

1. First: In the institution of baptism the Spirit is placed in the same number with the Father and the Son; therefore He is a Person. And the reason is: Because no reason can be given by the adversaries why He should be numbered among persons, if He is not a Person.

2. Secondly, because not only can no reason be supplied by them, but there are reasons against them. For let them show us in Scripture where God along with His attribute (for they consider the Holy Spirit to be a divine attribute) is placed in such an order, that both God and that attribute are said to command something. Let them produce even one example of this.

3. Nay, let them also show us this—where, in the name of this or that attribute, something is commanded by God to be done.

4. Therefore these things most clearly prove that the Holy Spirit is a Person. But now let us come to another argument: and it is this: That things are attributed to Him in Scripture which most clearly prove that He is a Person; such as that the Holy Spirit is said to speak—Scripture repeatedly emphasizes this. But whoever speaks is a Person.

5. The adversaries reply that this is said of the Holy Spirit by prosopopoeia. But they are greatly mistaken; for these very words of theirs clearly overthrow their delusion.

First, because Scripture says, "Well spoke the Holy Spirit concerning you," Acts 28. Let them show us whether this manner of speaking is accustomed to contain prosopopoeia?

6. A similar form of speech occurs in Acts chapter 13, where these things are read concerning the Holy Spirit, verse 2: "And as they were ministering to the Lord and fasting, the Holy Spirit said, 'Set apart for me Barnabas and Saul for the work to which I have called them.'" Again, let them see how they can attribute prosopopoeia to this mode of speaking.

7

But let us come to other things which are said concerning the Holy Spirit, and from which it can plainly be proved that He is a Person. And therefore there is also this: that in Acts chapter 20, verse 28, the Holy Spirit is said to have appointed bishops. Can anything of this sort—something that is not a person—be said to ordain and appoint this or that man to any rank of dignity? Let them strain every nerve here, and produce even a single example of such a thing. But why do I demand examples, when it is contrary to the nature of the matter and to right reason itself for someone to be placed in any office by that which is not a Person?

8

This is also most clearly proved by the fact that Scripture expressly says of the Holy Spirit that He testifies; and it even adds the manner in which He is accustomed to testify—namely, by speaking, which mode of testimony is plainly proper to a Person alone. This appears from Acts 20:24. For the Holy Spirit repeatedly testifies in every city, saying, "Bonds and afflictions await me."

9

But perhaps the adversaries will say that this is attributed to the Holy Spirit because He accomplished it through the prophets?

10

Not only on that account, but also because He Himself speaks as the principal cause. This appears in 2 Samuel chapter 23, verse 2. Countless such examples could be supplied, which we leave untouched because it will be easy for anyone, from these and other phrases said of the Holy Spirit, to gather and conclude that the Holy Spirit is a Person.

11

But here the adversaries object certain things against this. They say:

1. “That which is in another is not a Person; but the Holy Spirit is in another, namely in God, 1 Corinthians 2:11. Therefore...”

12

We reply that this objection is most empty. For the Father is in the Son, and the Son is in the Father, and yet each is a Person. See John chapter 14, verses 10–11.

13

But here they confront us and say that the manner in which something is “in another” renders the one who is in the other not a person. Now the Holy Spirit is said to be in God, but God is not said to be in the Holy Spirit.

14

But by what reasoning will they prove to us what they assert?

Secondly, we reply: although it cannot be shown literally from Scripture that the Holy Spirit is in the Father, yet it will be proved by a most certain consequence. For either God is “in the Holy Spirit,” or He is not. If He is, we gain what we want; if He is not, then God will be finite, because He will not be in something that exists.

15

They say: “God exists in substances, not in accidents.”

16

We reply: indeed, God exists in all beings—but not as a subject situated within the circumstance of place, but as a preserving cause within His effects, as we have shown elsewhere. Therefore it follows that it cannot be denied that, if the Holy Spirit exists, God also exists in Him; and since He is not a creature, He exists in God the Father in another manner than He exists in all created things

17.

There is also this in addition: that the Essence which is the Father’s is likewise the Son’s and the Holy Spirit’s, as we have shown in the preceding disputations. How

then, if the Essence of all the Persons is the same, can it not be said that one Person is *in* another?

18.

But let us now come to other things which the adversaries bring forward against this doctrine. Among other things, they argue this: that the Spirit of God is spoken of, and a comparison is made between Him and the spirit of man. But, they say, “The spirit of man is not a Person. Therefore...”

19.

But we reply: the comparison between these is instituted **not in every respect**, but only with respect to certain things—something which even the adversaries themselves are forced to concede. For if the comparison were made in every respect, then it would necessarily follow that, just as the spirit of man is a *part* of man, so also the Spirit of God would be a *part* of God. But this is utterly absurd.

20.

Secondly, it would follow that God is composed—and composed out of parts, and indeed out of essential parts. For whatever thing’s spirit is a part of it, the matter of that thing is another part (as can be shown by induction). Therefore God would be a body, and therefore properly speaking *quantitative*, and therefore *finite*.

21.

Therefore the comparison stands only between those terms between which Scripture itself establishes it—namely, that just as no one knows the things of a man except the spirit of the man which is in him, so no one knows the things of God except the Spirit of God who is in Him.

22.

But now let us come to the other part, namely, that the Holy Spirit is true God. We prove this both by express passages and by consequence.

23.

The following passages show expressly that He is God. The first place is taken from 2 Samuel chapter 23, verses 2 and 3. For the One who in verse 2 is pointed out as *the Spirit of Jehovah*, He in verse 3 is called *the God of Israel*.

24.

Nor is there any reason for the adversaries to say that verse 3 is spoken of God the Father, while verse 2 is spoken of the Spirit of God. For besides the fact that God is joined with the Holy Spirit *without any copulative conjunction* (even though the discourse is connected by a copulative conjunction), in such a way that the same work is attributed to both, this further reason proves it: that the Psalmist, after saying in verse 2 that the Spirit of God spoke in him, says in verse 3 *what* was spoken. Therefore these things must be understood of one and the same Person.

25.

The second place where He is expressly called God is taken from Acts chapter 5, verses 3 and 4. For when Peter had previously said that Ananias had lied to the Holy Spirit, he adds that he had not lied to men but to God—calling Him “God” against whom Ananias had lied.

26.

The adversaries respond in various ways to this, saying that it is possible that he lied both to the Holy Spirit and to God—the former as the less principal agent, the latter as the principal one.

27.

We respond, first: If we say that one lies to the Holy Spirit, then certainly He will be intelligent; for we are never said to lie to anyone except to one who is intelligent. How therefore will this agree with their doctrine, who teach that the Spirit of God is only some power of God or an accident?

28.

Secondly, Peter is speaking in this place about the one to whom Ananias lied not in any manner whatsoever, but as supreme Lord and Lawgiver. For those words cannot be taken in any other sense (since Ananias had lied to Peter and others) than in that same sense in which those things contained in 1 Samuel chapter 8 verse 7 are taken. But the supreme Lord is only one, and that is God.

29.

*But they press further this point: that when it is said of the Holy Spirit, it is said that Ananias lied **in** Him; whereas when it is said of God, it is said that he lied **to** Him—which two expressions seem to contain some difference.*

30.

*Response: They contain no difference in meaning. For both this expression and that signify the same thing; and that to lie **in** the Holy Spirit means the same as to lie **to** the Holy Spirit, we show in this way: In the same sense in which Sapphira (v. 9) is said to have **tempted** the Holy Spirit, in that same sense Ananias is said to have **lied** to the Holy Spirit—for no reason can be given why, in the same kind of sin, one thing should be said of the husband and another of the wife. But Sapphira is therefore said to have tempted the Spirit of the Lord because she lied to the Holy Spirit. Therefore in the same sense it is asserted of Ananias that he lied to the Holy Spirit; and consequently the verb, whether it is joined with the genitive case or with the dative, has the same meaning in both places.*

31.

*But now let us come to the arguments which are deduced by consequence. We assert at present these two. The first is taken from this: that He is **in** God; therefore, if He is in God, He will be God. For whatever is in God is God.*

32.

The adversaries respond that He is not God.

33.

If He is not God, then He will be a creature; for whatever exists is either God or creature.

34.

They respond that there is something which is neither God nor creature—such as the action of God, and the faculties by which God does whatever He wills.

35.

But we respond simply by denying what is said—namely, that there is posited a third something between creatures and the Creator, which is received in God Himself. For this is simply repugnant to the highest and infinite simplicity of God, which admits no

composition within His essence, so that whatever is in God is God Himself; and just as also the actions and faculties of God, although they are distinguished among themselves by reason of their objects and effects, nevertheless place nothing in God that is different from His Essence.

36.

The second argument which we assert for proving this—that the Holy Spirit is God—is that He is eternal. For what is eternal is not a creature; therefore He is God. And the minor premise is not only most clear in Scripture (as in Hebrews 9:14), but is also proved by reason. For God was never without this Spirit; therefore just as God is eternal, so also is the Spirit.

37.

But now let us come to the objections. It is objected first that Christ says that the Holy Spirit will speak nothing from Himself, but only what He will hear (John 16). But this is foreign to one who is true God.

38.

*We respond that the phrase “not to speak from himself” can admit a twofold meaning: either so that it denotes an **order** in acting or speaking; or so that it denotes a **difference** [of cause or principle]. Here it is shown that it denotes the order of acting, because otherwise the Holy Spirit would not speak in the same manner in which Christ preaches through Him. But Christ preaches through the Spirit such that He (Christ) is an equally principal cause of the Holy Spirit as the Son—as is clear from the things that are said concerning the Spirit in Scripture, Acts chapter 28 verse 25 compared with Isaiah chapter 6 verses 8–10. In Scripture God speaks as a principal cause; therefore the particle “through” does not denote a diversity of cause, but an order of acting.*

39.

It is objected, second: The true God is invoked through the Mediator; the Holy Spirit is not invoked through the Mediator. Therefore [He is not true God].

40.

*We respond by distinguishing between **absolute** invocation and **relative** invocation—a distinction taken from the object of invocation. We call that invocation absolute which is directed to God, that is, to the whole Trinity; and this absolutely pertains to*

the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, by which reasoning all the Persons are invoked through the Mediator. But relative invocation is that which is directed to some particular Person; and thus to be invoked through the Mediator belongs primarily to the Father, who is as it were the principle of counsel and order in reconciling the human race; afterward it also belongs to the Son, who carries that counsel into effect; and finally to the Holy Spirit, insofar as there is the same will of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit concerning the redemption of the human race.

41.

*Invocation is said to be absolute and relative on account of a twofold consideration of the object—relative and absolute; for either we invoke God absolutely in His essence, or we direct our invocation to a certain Person of the Godhead. By reason of the former it is called **absolute**; by reason of the latter, **relative**.*

COROLLARIES

I

That Christ is expressly said in John 16:14 to be about to receive the Holy Spirit from Him and to announce Him to the disciples, and likewise that it is said in John 3:34 that God does not measure out the Spirit to Him, most clearly show that in Christ there are two natures.

II

The Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son, and the reason is that He is called the Spirit of the Son in Galatians 4:6 and Romans 8. He who is called the Spirit of God is the same who is also called the Spirit of Christ. The second reason is that He is so the Spirit of the Son that He is sent by the Son (John 16:7, 14). But if one is sent, he is sent either by authority, or by counsel, or by natural production. He is not sent by authority, since He is God; nor by counsel, since He is also God—for one who is such is instructed by one wiser than himself. Therefore [He is sent] by natural procession.

III

The Holy Spirit assumed the form of a dove (Luke 3:22). From this it is apparent that He is not a bare power, since the notion of a supposit is clearly shown to the eyes through the assumed form of a dove.

END